



BELLARMINE COMMENTARY

Vol. 1	MARCH, 1956	No. 1
--------	-------------	-------

CONTENTS

Articles

	<i>page</i>
Baptism: sufficient sign of incorporation in the Mystical Body? Aloysius Church, S.J.	3
Except for Adultery? Ralph Eastwell, S.J.	6
An historical note on the prayer "Passio Domini" John Cooke, S.J.	11
Anglicans and South India Gerard Hughes, S.J.	14

Some recent theological literature in Summary and Review

(i) <i>The Sacraments in General</i>	20
(ii) <i>Penance</i>	25
(iii) <i>Other Sacraments</i>	29
(iv) <i>The Church</i>	34
(v) <i>Scripture</i>	36
(vi) <i>Other Questions</i>	39

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY is to be produced twice yearly, for private circulation only, by the theologian scholastics of Heythrop College. All communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Bellarmine Commentary, Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon., England.

EDITORIAL

Bellarmino Commentary is the work of the Jesuit students of theology of Heythrop College. The title is that of their patron, together with the least they hope to be able to achieve in their writing.

- - - - -

Each of the half-yearly numbers of *Bellarmino Commentary* will consist of articles on questions that are either the subject of discussion among theologians to-day, or that are of special interest in themselves. Together with these, there will be reviews and summaries of selected recent theological writing. The principles of selection, ideally at least, are the worthiness of the piece of writing in question as a contribution to sacred learning, and the general interest of the subject matter. For the most part, the matter selected for comment in this number has appeared in the last twelve months.

- - - - -

It is proposed that the contents of each number be grouped around a central theme which has recently been the subject of a course of study for those who contribute. Thus the present number is mostly, though not exclusively, concerned with Sacramental Theology, both in general, and, as regards five of the sacraments, more in particular. Two of them, Holy Eucharist and Orders, will be the special concern of the next issue, although an article on Anglicans and South India, of more topical interest now, has been included in this.

- - - - -

To what extent this aim has been achieved is for readers to judge, and the Editor would greatly welcome any criticisms and suggestions to which this and subsequent numbers may give rise.

- - - - -

It would have been impossible to contemplate this enterprise without the constant advice and encouragement of the professors of the Theological Faculty at Heythrop, and the support of benefactors both within and without the Society. To them goes the wholehearted gratitude of all concerned in the production of this journal.

BAPTISM: SUFFICIENT SIGN OF INCORPORATION IN THE MYSTICAL BODY?

ALOYSIUS CHURCH, S.J.

SINCE the publication of *Humani Generis* all doubts as to the identification of the Mystical Body of Christ with the Roman Catholic Church have been removed. It is no longer possible to seek a place for our separated non-catholic brethren in the Mystical Body under the mantle of its spiritual and mystical elements: their position must be explained in terms of the visible and juridical mission of the Roman Catholic Church. Within these limits, however, there is room for discussion, and the particular problem that will be treated in this article is the relation of dissident Christians of good faith to the Church.

They do present a problem. For we know that a good Protestant can have a valid Baptism, and, if he remains in good faith, can be saved and reach heaven. We must maintain the principle "*Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*" and so at first sight we seem forced to concede that he is a member of the Church. If he is a member of the Church, he is also a member of the Mystical Body of Christ, since the two are co-terminous.

But how would we reconcile such membership with the Catholic concept of the visible nature of the Church? Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis* (1) writes:

"... if the Church is a body it must be something one and undivided . . . And not only must it be one and undivided, it must also be something concrete and visible."

And later on he adds (2):

"Only those are to be accounted really (reapse) members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by legitimate authority . . . It follows that those who are divided from one another in faith or government cannot be living in the one Body so described, and by its one divine Spirit."

To accept the good Protestant as a member of the Church would seem to contradict the teaching of *Mystici Corporis*. Yet we know he can be saved. We seem forced to make a division between the "juridical" Church, or those living in communion with Rome, and the Church of charity or the "spiritual" Church, consisting of those who are united invisibly to Christ though visibly disunited from Rome. The temptation is to identify this latter with the Mystical Body, and to declare it wider in extension, on earth, than the body corporate visibly associated with the successor of St. Peter. As we have seen, however, the Mystical Body, however mystical, is none the less visible.

Before considering some recent treatments of the problem, it may be well to consider one of the classical attempts to solve it. Its origin is attributed to St. Robert Bellarmine, who certainly held it, and it is the answer that springs to the mind of many Catholics today and, indeed, has been embodied in some catechisms. Bellarmine distinguishes the Body and the Soul of the Church. The Body is identified on earth with those in union with the Pope; the Soul embraces all who are united by sanctifying grace to Christ, and includes the good Protestant.

But the theory has considerable inconveniences. In the first place, the Holy Ghost is commonly called the Soul of the Mystical Body, either personally, or by His gifts (3). Secondly, the notion seems to destroy the force of St. Paul's comparison, for here we have a body which is a soul and not a body at all, whereas in St. Paul's conception it is precisely to Christ as Head of the body, not the soul, that the members are said to be united.

That this theory is not as commonly held as may be supposed, is clear from a report of the dogmatic Commission, preparatory to the Vatican Council, which contains the following:

"Alius (consultor) fusiùs evolvi voluisset distinctionem inter animam et corpus Ecclesiae, quia necessarium hoc est ad intellegentiam dogmatis 'Extra Ecclesiam non est salus'. At septem consultores dixerunt distinctionem hanc penitus omittendam utpote scholasticam et novam omnino in modo loquendi conciliorum." (4)

The distinction is not acceptable, then, because it favours the dissociation of the juridical from the spiritual element in the constitution of the Church. Whatever explanation is given must preserve its visible nature and avoid any tendency to identify the Mystical Body solely with a spiritual, invisible entity.

In a recent article (5), Father Richard defends the view that the Sacrament of Baptism visibly incorporates all Christians into the Body of the Church. He argues that it is a visible sign, it imposes an indelible character on the soul, and, like all Sacraments, it is an act of the Church. He also uses the fact that the Church's marriage legislation is binding on all baptised people. The Brief *Singulari Nobis* 1749 is quoted, where Benedict XIV declares:

"Eum qui baptismum ab haeretico suscepit, illius vi, Ecclesiae Catholicae membrum esse tenemus."

He also quotes St. Augustine on the Sacraments:

"Itaque est una Ecclesia, quae sola Catholica nominatur: et quidquid suum habet in communionibus a sua unitate separatis, per hoc quod suum in eis habet, ipsa utique generat non illae."

Thus according to Fr. Richard, Baptism is the beginning of the Christian's membership. It is the first essential step and constitutes a fundamental ontological link with the Mystical Body. It is a true incorporation, but there remains more to be done, namely, the fuller growth of the member through the other sacraments. Confirmation and Holy Orders impress further characters on the soul, but it is principally in the communion of the Eucharist that the incorporation reaches its full perfection.

Thus Fr. Richard maintains that even within the Catholic Church there are degrees of membership, and he argues that the same principle can be applied to dissident Christians. In his view, the dissident Christian is a member of the Church, and that membership is in the visible order through the visible rite of Baptism, but his membership is imperfect and incomplete.

Fr. Richard may appear to have gone very far in conceding membership through the spiritual effects and visible signs of the sacraments. It might be urged in his support that what remains to be fulfilled in the juridical and external order is of secondary importance, and that em-

phasis on externals is to take a too legalistic view of the Church of Christ. Nevertheless union with the See of St. Peter does require emphasis, and that emphasis does not narrow our view of the Church.

A more attractive solution is that of Fr. Brunet in another recent article (6). He treats of the question of the dissident Christian of good faith, and by an illuminating exegesis of the word *soma* in St. Paul, finds that the essential function of the Church is to give witness to the truth, and on these grounds excludes dissident Christians from its Body.

Most writers, treating of the text of St. Paul where he speaks of the Church as the Body of Christ, base their exegesis on the current Greek meaning of the word *soma*. Fr. Brunet refers to an article by Fr. Malevez (7) where he makes the point that the word is not to be interpreted according to its Greek connotation, but rather, since St. Paul was a Jew with a judaistic background, his use of words is likely to be semitic, and the true Pauline meaning of *soma* is to be found in the Hebrew *basar*.

Now the Greek and Western use of the term body connotes something in sharp distinction from the soul and the person; it is used to contrast the corporeal with the spiritual. But the semitic mind uses the term in an altogether different sense. Far from opposing body to soul, it assumes their unity in the concrete: in short, it regards the body as the outward manifestation of the person. Thus Pedersen (8) writes of this usage:

"... soul and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than 'united': the body is the soul in its outward form."

Fr. Malevez concludes:

"Par conséquent en faisant de l'Eglise 'le corps du Christ', Paul donnait à entendre qu'elle est le Christ, non pas simplement toutefois, mais le Christ spirituel manifesté, et comme rendu sensible."

The important conclusion from this is that the Church, the Body of Christ, is essentially visible. Its function is to manifest Christ, not only in a purely symbolical sense but by a real identity. Thus there is no place for division, for discordant voices and contradictory messages. Every Christian who is called to membership of that Body is also called to give witness to the truth. The Word when He assumed a body was the revelation of the Father to men; the Church, His Mystical Body, is the revelation of the Son to succeeding generations.

"I am the light of the world."

"You are the light of the world."

"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."

"I in them and Thou in me."

"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?"

Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis* (9) speaks in similar terms:

"... the Church becomes as it were the fullness and completion of the Redeemer, Christ in the Church being in some sense brought to complete achievement ... Christ, Head and Body, is the whole Christ."

Now, Fr. Brunet argues, if the essential function of this Mystical Body is to manifest Christ and give witness to his truth, it is difficult to see how membership can be conceded to those whose principal witness consists in a denial of the authority of the Vicar of Christ, the visible head on earth of His Body. This denial seems to be fundamentally

opposed to the visible unity of the Body, and it would seem to put them outside its organism. They cannot be said to be joining it in its mission.

Our separated brethren, then, according to Fr. Brunet, are definitely outside the Body. He suggests, however, that there are ways in which they can be related to the Body, and states that more theologians today are following this line, making a distinction in the manner in which separated souls can be said to be related to the Body (e.g. in voto, explicitly or implicitly), rather than making distinctions (like Fr. Richard) inside the Body itself. This seems more in accord with the teaching of *Mystici Corporis*, and indeed it is difficult to interpret the following passage in any other sense:

"... for, though they may be related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by some unconscious yearning or desire, yet they are deprived of those many great heavenly gifts and aids which can be enjoyed only in the Catholic Church. Let them enter Catholic Unity therefore, and, joined with Us in the one organism of the Body of Jesus Christ, hasten together to the one Head in the fellowship of most glorious love." (10)

In bestowing the gift of infallibility on St. Peter, and in constituting him the visible head, in His place, of the juridical society that was to continue His revelation of Himself, Christ effected a perfect union between His Spirit and His Body, the Church. Those who are not united to that visible head cannot be said to be within the Body, and their union with its Spirit suffers as a result. It is only by their full co-operation and union with the Vicar of Christ that St. Paul's comparison can be fully verified in them. Union in one hierarchy and in one faith exhibits again to the world the living organism of Christ's Body.

Fr. Brunet concludes with the reflection that his theory is to be understood within the context of the sacramental system in the widest meaning of the term. Visible unity with the Vicar of Christ is only one of the ways in which God has willed to use visible signs in the general plan of our salvation. Our task is to work for the building up of this visible Body, this sign raised in the midst of the nations, until Christ be fully formed in us.

References:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) <i>Mystici Corporis</i> 14. | (6) <i>Analecta Gregoriana</i> , 68(1954)199. |
| (2) <i>Ibid.</i> 21. | (7) <i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i> |
| (3) <i>Ibid.</i> 55. | 33 (1944) 83. |
| (4) <i>Mansi</i> , 49, 624-625. | (8) <i>Israel</i> , I-II. London, 1946: p.171 |
| (5) <i>Nouvelle Revue Theologique</i> , | (9) <i>Mystici Corporis</i> 77. |
| 74 (1952) 485. | (10) <i>Ibid.</i> 102. |

EXCEPT FOR ADULTERY ?

A comment on the exegesis of Mt 5, 32 and 19, 3.

RALPH EASTWELL, S.J.

SEVERAL times in Our Lord's public life the Pharisees attempted to trap Him into a damaging statement of His doctrine, to discredit Him with the people or to supply a reason for His arrest. Such was the case related in Mt 19, 3-9 and Mk 10, 2-12.

According to Dt 24, 1-14 divorce is tolerated, but discouraged by the imposition of certain legal formalities: a man could give his wife a

bill of divorcement "if she find not favour in his eyes for some uncleanness", but if she married again she might not return to the first husband. The precise meaning of this "uncleanness" (Heb: *erwath dabar*; LXX: *aschemon pragma*) was much disputed in the schools: Shammai held that it meant only adultery; Hillel interpreted it as almost any defect in the wife — even her bad cooking!

So the Pharisees came to Our Lord, "tempting Him, saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" For which rabbinical school would He declare Himself? His first answer plainly ignores the disputed point altogether: He quotes, not Deuteronomy, but Genesis, going directly to the institution of marriage by the Creator: a married couple are one flesh; "What, therefore, God hath joined together let no man put asunder". But the Pharisees persist: "Why, then, did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and to put away?". Surely now He will either contradict Himself or contradict Moses. "Jesus removes the contradiction by correcting their terms: divorce was not a Mosaic 'command' but a toleration of an existing custom. This custom itself was due to Israel's hardness of heart, a moral immaturity insensitive to God's will — a will made plain, as Our Lord says, in Gen 1. 27." (C. Comm 708c). "And I say to you that whosoever shall put his wife away, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery."

What precisely does this "exceptive clause" mean? Is it a permission of divorce for adultery, confirming the school of Shammai? Is the clause an interpolation, perhaps by Matthew himself, but the first instance of a long chain of attempts to adapt Christ's teaching to the hardness of hearts — and the hardness of cases? If it is neither of these, what did He really mean? And what of the similar exceptive clause in Mt 5, 32?

It is not the purpose of this paper to prove that Our Lord condemned divorce and that His words have absolute binding force for all ages. Nor do we wish to enter into the textual question, except to state that the exceptive clauses appear in substantially the same form in all Mss and all versions. Rather do we intend to attempt to summarise the chief positive explanations given by Catholic exegetes.

1. The classical view: *apoluse* in Mt 19, 9 and *apoluson* in Mt 5, 32 (DV: "put away") refer to what the scholastics call *divortium imperfectum*, *separatio a thoro et mensa*, with no permission to re-marry. *Porneia* (DV: fornication) means adultery. So the sense is that, although a man may separate from his wife because of her adultery, he may not marry again. This was held by St. Jerome, St. Augustine (sometimes), St. Thomas, Maldonatus, a Lapide and many other eminent men, and is still held widely today.

On the other hand, the same words (*apolusai*, *apoluse*) in Mt 19, 3:8 and Mt 5, 31 certainly mean *divortium perfectum*, and to give them a different meaning in the exceptive clause seems somewhat arbitrary. Nor was *divortium imperfectum* well-known to the Jews and would thus have needed clearer phraseology than Matthew gives it.

2. Christ was acting purely as an interpreter of the Mosaic Law and not giving His own doctrine on the matter, which He had indicated sufficiently clearly in His answer to the first question. This, proposed in the last century by Grimm, is held today by Sickenberger and Tafi.

The objections are fairly obvious: it cannot apply in any way to Mt 5, 32 where Our Lord is clearly contrasting His doctrine with that of Exodus. In any case, He came to fulfil the Mosaic Law — to bring it to completion, not to interpret it.

3. Our Lord was prescinding completely from the rabbinical dispute. He excludes all reference to the unchastity of the wife and makes His law absolute, applicable also to an unfaithful spouse. This is defended by Arendzen and Vawter and seems to be presupposed in the Knox version. *Parektos* (in Mt 5, 32) means “outside”, “without”, “apart from”, as the lexicons declare. The classical view takes this word with *logou porneias* as a parenthesis relative to *apoluon* (put away) and so renders: “The man who puts away his wife, *apart from the case of unfaithfulness*, makes an adulteress of her . . .” etc. This view, on the other hand, takes *parektos* with *logou porneias* as an absolute parenthesis, meaning: “The man who puts away his wife (*setting aside the matter of unfaithfulness*), makes an adulteress of her . . .” (Knox). Thus Christ was not interested in the rabbinical disputes; whatever *erwath dabar* might or might not mean was beside the point. And so, interpreting the admittedly cryptic *me epi porneias* of Mt 19, 9 in the light of this rendering of Mt 5, 32, Mgr. Knox gives us the former passage as: “He who puts away his wife, *not for any unfaithfulness of hers*, and so marries another, commits adultery.” Whether she is unfaithful or not, he is not justified in marrying again. Arendzen quotes two Pauline instances: II Cor 11, 28 (*choris ton parektos*) and Acts 26, 29 (*parektos ton desmon*) which certainly might bear his meaning, but might equally well bear the meaning “except for . . .” St. Augustine and St. Robert Bellarmine defended a similar view. But it does not seem to do away with the ambiguity.

4. Brunec and Zerwick propose yet another grammatical solution: *epi* means “outside the case of” and *me* means “even not”. Thus we get “even not outside the case of unfaithfulness”, or “even inclusive of unfaithfulness”. Our Lord said that not even for unfaithfulness could a man divorce his wife and marry again. *Parektos*, these writers say, can also have an inclusive meaning, and Mt 5, 32 means “Whoever dismisses his wife, besides the *porneia* (which was the cause of his dismissing her) makes her (also) to commit adultery”.

These linguistic gymnastics, as Vawter calls them, will not appeal to everyone and one may wonder whether the readers of Gk Mt would have understood such subtleties in their reading of the text.

5. Dollinger and Cornely in the last century accepted the grammatical construction of the classical view, but denied that *porneia* necessarily meant adultery. It has a very broad sense in biblical Greek, embracing any kind of impurity, but in the present cases it is more likely that it means incest. Fr. Bonsirven expounds and defends this view in his book: “Le Divorce dans le Nouveau Testament” (1948), and it has found considerable favour in recent years, notably with Prat. St. Paul

uses *porneia* in several senses (Col 3, 5; I Cor 6, 8:13; I Cor 7, 2; II Cor 12, 21; Gal 5, 19; Eph 5, 3; I Thess 4, 3) and in most of these the meaning does not seem to be tied down absolutely to any one kind of impurity, and very doubtfully to adultery. In I Cor 5, 1 it certainly means incest, and there is a good case for saying that incest is in question in Acts 15, 20:29, where three of the prohibitions of the Council of Jerusalem certainly confirm those of Leviticus 17. If the third — *porneia* — is taken in the broad sense of fornication it seems somewhat out of place in its context: there is no apparent reason for thinking that the converts in question needed such an exhortation. Moreover the next Mosaic prohibition (Lev 18) refers to marriage within certain degrees of kindred and it seems reasonable to suppose that the Council was following the order of Leviticus throughout, and has incest in mind. Lightfoot and Strack-Billerbeck agree. So when Our Lord answered the second question of the Pharisees He anticipated a third question, based on Lev. 18; if He had not qualified His condemnation, the Pharisees might have retorted: "What of the attitude of John the Baptist to the marriage of Herod and Herodias?" (Mark says explicitly that Herod married Herodias, although the union was invalid according to Mosaic Law). Thus we have: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, except it be for incest . . .". When Mt's gospel was translated into Greek the translator would quite naturally have rendered "incest" by the same word used by Paul in I Cor 5, 1 and in the decree of the Council.

Arendzen criticises this view on two counts: firstly the supposition that Christ was anticipating a third difficulty, from Leviticus, is possible but by no means proved. Further, it seems to make Him say: "If a man put away his wife—unless of course she is not his wife . . .", which seems an unnecessary qualification.

6. Fr. Vaccari proposes an amendment to the Bonsirven view: Christ is referring not merely to cases of incest but to all invalid unions. There is no word in Hebrew, Aramaic or the koine for our "wife". The Greek New Testament uses *gune*, which is applied indifferently to St. Elizabeth (Lk 1, 24), to the woman who put the leaven in the meal (Mt 13, 33) and to the Samaritan woman (Jn 4). So, by itself, (like *porneia*) it is ambiguous. Our Lord could not leave any ambiguity in His answer to the Pharisees — and still less in His official promulgation of the New Law in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5, 32). No real marriage can be broken up: what God has joined together let no man put asunder. Amplifying this in reply to the second question, He says in effect: "Whosoever puts away his *woman*, providing he is not living with her in concubinage, and marries another, commits adultery". This avoids the tautology criticised by Canón Arendzen and does not suppose that Our Lord was necessarily anticipating an objection from Leviticus. It takes *me epi porneia* and *parektos logou porneias* at their face value as real exceptions and bases itself on what seems to be a very reasonable view of the situation, with no suggestion of special pleading. Briefly, therefore: both *gune* and *porneia* are ambiguous unless qualified; Our Lord qualifies *gune* because this was essential to exclude any possible misunderstanding; He has already said that a real marriage is made by God and is therefore indissoluble; the only kind of union which can (and should) be dis-

solved is an impure union, a union of fornication or of incest, or a union made null by any other kind of impediment.

An incidental advantage of this view is that we can take all the common translations (except, perhaps, that of Mgr. Knox which is based on his own interpretation) without any alteration: the "*fornicatio*" of the Vulgate, the "fornication" of the Douai (and Revised) version, the "impurity" of the Westminster, and the "immorality" of the American Confraternity version. This simplifies the controversial situation considerably: a long grammatical disquisition at the beginning of a discussion is apt to weary even scholars, and is hardly likely to appeal to the less learned! By confining the explanation, to all intents and purposes, to the meaning of *gune* (very similar in its New Testament usage, after all, to that of some modern languages) we are able to get to the point far more quickly.

One final point remains. Mark (10, 2-12), Luke (16, 16) and Paul (Rom 7, 2-3; I Cor 7, 10-12) all give the teaching on divorce without any such qualification of the word *gune*. The answer must take into account the different settings, of the works themselves and of the passages within the works. Mark gives an account of the same encounter with the Pharisees but, according to his habit, omits the references to the Mosaic Law as likely to confuse his Gentile readers. But, as Roman Law (unlike that of the Jews) allowed a wife to divorce her husband, he applies Our Lord's teaching to this case also. Luke mentions Christ's teaching on divorce as part of a general summary of the doctrine which Matthew gives in the Sermon on the Mount. He introduces this teaching by a reference to the passing of the Old Law, and the passage about divorce is "a cited example of the way in which Jesus means His teaching about the fulfilment of the Law to be understood." (C. Comm 761d). Not having the solemnity of Matthew's account, there is no need for the same precision of wording. In any case, Luke's hearers must be supposed familiar with the Pauline teaching on marriage, which is quite unequivocal. In both Romans and Corinthians the context makes it quite clear that Paul is speaking of real marriage: in Romans he uses the freeing of a woman from the "law of her husband" by death to illustrate the freeing of all men from the Law of Moses by the death of Christ. In Corinthians he says (7, 9) that marriage is a remedy for fornication, thus contrasting lawful wedlock with illicit unions. In neither case is there need for any further clarification of the word *gune*.

* * * *

To each of these solutions has gone a great deal of expert thought and study, and none is to be condemned out of hand. On the whole, it seems that Fr. Vaccari gives the most probable explanation. But the question is still an open one, and perhaps an even better solution may yet be found.

Sources:

Bonsirven: "Le Divorce dans le Nouveau Testament".

Arendzen: Clergy Review, 21 (1941) 23.

Dyson-Leeming: Clergy Review, 20 (1941) 283.

Tafi: Verbum Domini, 26 (1948) 18.

Vaccari: Biblica, 36 (1955) 149.

Rivista Biblica, 3 (1955) 97.

Vawter: Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 16 (1954) 155.

A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (1953).

AN HISTORICAL NOTE ON THE PRAYER "PASSIO DOMINI"

JOHN COOKE, S.J.

THE clause "quidquid boni feceris . . . sit tibi in remissionem peccatorum" in the prayer "Passio Domini" that the priest says after giving absolution, gives rise to a problem which authors still treat of today. The problem is: does this clause elevate all the good acts of the penitent to sacramental satisfaction? If so it might be of interest to the faithful generally to know this. We are not however directly concerned here with the theological aspect: rather the writer only aims at giving a few steps in the history of the clause.

In the penitential written in or about 1200 by Robert of Flamborough (probably an Englishman, and canon of St. Victor's, Paris) we gather that canonical penances were still in use at the beginning of the 13th century. We also learn that penitents were often not ready to accept these canonical penances for their sins, and Robert advises confessors to reduce the penance until the penitent accepts it. He also treats of *paenitentiae redemptio*, i.e. the lawful substitution for a good reason of other good works for some part of the canonical penance, the scale of *redemptio* being carefully worked out. Here is an example: "For one day which he should fast in bread and water, let him sing fifty psalms kneeling in church, if he can".

Between 1215 and 1225 another canon of St. Victor's, Peter of Poitiers, also wrote a penitential. We find here that canonical penances are still in use, that there is still a recognised scale of *redemptio* and that penitents are reluctant to accept the canonical penance. After these two authors, according to Morinus, one hardly finds another who treats of *paenitentiae redemptio* as still existing: and Morinus suggests that perhaps the substitution had come to be at the penitent's discretion. We find a confirmation in a contemporary of St. Albert the Great, the Glossator of Raymund. He writes:

"Propter vitandam inobedientiam consulo quod aut nulla aut pauca iniungantur sub praecepto; concedendo quod liceat ei ieiunium sibi iniunctum, aut orationes, aut eleemosynas et quaecumque alia sibi iniuncta redimere cum voluerit."

Strictly speaking we have not yet reached the idea of a penance enjoined in universal terms, but only an undetermined substitution for a specified penance. The distinction may seem a mere subtlety. In any case we are very close to a penance enjoined in general terms.

In the next generation, in the middle of the 13th century we find in St. Thomas what seems to be the first instance of the phrase "quidquid boni feceris . . .". We say that it seems to be the first instance, for Suarez, Vasquez and Paludanus all refer to this passage and go no further. The passage is in Quodlibet 3 art. 28. A Quodlibet treated of all manner of unconnected questions. The 13th Question of this Quodlibet, for example, is divided into two articles, 28 and 29:

"Deinde quaesitum est de paenitentia; et circa hoc quaesita sunt duo: 1o. Utrum si aliquis sacerdos paenitenti dicat, 'Quidquid boni feceris sit tibi in remissionem peccatorum' sit satisfactio sacramentalis; 2o, etc."

The second query concerns the recitation of the office. Art. 28 has for title:

"Utrum satisfactio universaliter iniuncta a sacerdote sit sacramentalis" and answering in the affirmative St. Thomas writes: "Unde laudabiliter consuevit hoc (i.e. quidquid etc.) a multis sacerdotibus dici."

It seems worth noticing first that we have word for word the phrase now found in our prayer "Passio Domini": secondly the absence of the clause "et mali sustinueris" need not suggest that it was not used then since it raises a distinct speculative question which St. Thomas is not treating here: thirdly St. Thomas writes "si aliquis sacerdos" and again "consuevit a multis sacerdotibus" which shows that it was not the general practice imposed by authority nor even the particular rite of some dioceses. Lastly we have no evidence of a liturgical formula for the presence of the identical phrase in the prayer "Passio Domini" would, it seems, be very well explained if the writer of the prayer had been a student of St. Thomas. For this phrase is much more concise than, for example, the two equivalents cited later. Further, would the treatment of a query in a Quodlibet not suggest that the question was topical and therefore arising from some new practice? True the question is still treated today, but usually in the section on satisfaction in a general treatise on Penance, and the same is true of its treatment in Paludanus, Suarez, Vasquez, de Lugo and St. Alphonsus.

After St. Thomas the question is often discussed whether satisfaction enjoined in general terms is sacramental. Early in 14th century Paludanus (1275-1342) treats it in his *Commentarium* in IV Sent. dist. 20:

"Considerandum est quod multo plus valet modica paenitentia per sacerdotem impositam quam maior a se assumpta. Quia ista secunda non est sacramentum nec pars sacramenti. Unde ex sola virtute assumptis habet effectum. Illa autem ex virtute Passionis Christi qui operatur specialiter in sacramentis totius Ecclesiae. Unde expedit ut sicut confitens aliqua confitetur in generali et aliqua in speciali, sic et confessor imponat aliquam paenitentiam in speciali et in generali bona quae faciet et mala pene (sic) quae sustinebit et quae etiam facere proponet."

We are approaching, if not the words, certainly the thoughts of the prayer "Passio Domini". We find the mention of Christ's passion, of the penitent's good actions and of his sufferings, and even of the words "mala sustinere" which are to appear in the form of the prayer as we know it. It may be said that Paludanus includes good intentions and that these are not mentioned in the prayer. But is that really true? Are these not covered by "Quidquid feceris"? If we consider that the external performance of itself adds nothing to the internal act, it seems to follow that a good intention, if it is a real intention, is an act and is therefore covered by "Quidquid feceris". This would very likely be the mind of the author of the prayer "Passio Domini" who does not seem to have left any redundant words in his composition.

Navarrus who died in 1586 wrote: "Corroboratur quinto, quod multorum laudanda confessariorum antiqua consuetudo habet ut absolutio dictatur: 'Quidquid boni feceris et facere proponis et proposueris et mala quae sustineris et sustinebis sint tibi in remissionem peccatorum'". From this we may conclude that in Navarrus's days in the

regions he knew, the imposition of the general penance was a widespread and ancient custom, but not yet enforced by ecclesiastical authority. This however does not seem to have been universally true. For in a *Pastorale* published by order of the Archbishop of Mechlin and printed in Antwerp in 1607, we find in the rite of penance a prayer very similar to the prayer "*Passio Domini*". After the "*misereatur*" and "*Indulgentiam*" the rubrical direction reads:

"*Deinde subiungat.*" (Then follows the prayer). "*Meritum Passionis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi et merita beatissimae Dei Genitricis Virginis Mariae et omnium sanctorum eius, bona per te facta et facienda cedant tibi in satisfactionem peccatorum tuorum.*"

And then the priest is to go on: "*Pro speciali vero paenitentia, legis aut facis hoc aut illud*". There follows a rubrical direction "*Hic iniungat paenitentiam delictis congruam*". The absolution follows.

Seven years later Paul V published the first *Rituale Romanum* and here we find the prayer "*Passio Domini*" as and where we find it in the rite of Penance today.

It would seem that the practice of giving general penance arose when canonical penance fell into disuse. Before this the general theory was that the canonical penance was adequate to satisfy completely for the temporal punishment still due to sin forgiven. This belief is expressed by Robert of Flamborough who, when urging the confessor to persuade the penitent to accept the canonical penance, advises the former to address the latter thus: "*Elige igitur tibi vel in hac vita sufficienter secundum paenitentias canonicas, vel authenticas puniri, vel Purgatorium acceptare*". When a canonical penance was imposed there would therefore be no reason to impose a further unspecified penance.

When however the idea got abroad that canonical penances were arbitrary, and penitents would no longer undertake them, confessors had to try to adapt the penances and find some substitute for the canonical and adequate penance. This they would do by trying to turn into sacramental satisfaction all the good works the penitent would do on his own initiative.

There is a prayer in an English Pontifical (9th-10th century) which might at first sight suggest that we have an example of general penance more than three hundred years before St. Thomas. Here is the prayer: "*Da quaesumus huic famulo tuo continuam purgationis suae observantiam paenitenda agere; et ut hoc efficaciter implere valeat, gratia eunae tuae visitationis praeveniat. Per Dominum. Amen*". But if we recall that the penitent has been enjoined a canonical penance, we readily see the true sense of the prayer which is to beg God to give the penitent His grace that he may perform his penance.

The history of the prayer "*Passio Domini*" then seems to be contained between the beginning of the 13th and that of the 16th centuries. The development of the idea seems to have been rapid since all the matter of the prayer is already found in Paludanus. On the other hand, the evidence from Navarrus and the Mechlin *Pastorale* seems to suggest that the form evolved rather slowly.

ANGLICANS AND SOUTH INDIA

GERARD HUGHES, S.J.

THERE is already a surfeit of pamphlets and articles written on the South India problem, but it is often difficult to follow them or to assess their worth, for they presume that the reader has some knowledge of the history, Constitution and Basis of Union of the Church of South India (C.S.I.), and of its precise relations with the Church of England. The purpose of this article is first to supply such background knowledge and then to consider briefly what is implied in the Anglicans' limited recognition of the C.S.I.

History of the C.S.I.

The movement towards a united Church of South India began in 1908 when almost all the Presbyterian and Congregational missions in South India joined in a Church which had certain federal characteristics, and which allowed much independence to the eight regional Churches of which it was composed. In 1919 the General Assembly of this new Church appointed a committee to confer with representatives of the Anglican Churches in India and with other bodies. In the following year the Episcopal Synod of the Anglican province in India (later known as the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon) appointed a similar committee. In 1925 the Methodists came into the negotiations. The Scheme of Union for a South Indian Church was published in 1929, and in 1947 the C.S.I. was inaugurated, numbering in all about 1,000,000 Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists and Anglicans. The Anglican Church of India, Burma and Ceylon had allowed four of its thirty-seven dioceses to join the C.S.I., but because of Anglican doubts about the orthodoxy of the new Church, the four dioceses were implicitly recognised as schismatic. However, they went into schism quite happily with the blessing and approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Constitution and Basis of Union of the C.S.I.

The Basis of Union is a document of the uniting Churches, drawn up before the inauguration of the C.S.I., and stating the general nature and purpose of the proposed union. It is incorporated into the Constitution, a 90-page document (Constitution of the Church of South India, Madras 1952) much of it being concerned with details of administrative organisation. The following is a summary with the more important passages given in full:—

The Constitution opens with the "Governing principles of the Church of South India". The unity of the Church is fundamentally a unity of the spiritual realm but it must find expression in the Faith and order of the Church, in its worship, organisation and whole life. The constitution is drawn up in the hope that each of the uniting Churches will not lose the continuity of its own life, but preserve that life enriched by the union. It is a "comprehensive Church, and its members, firmly holding the fundamentals of the faith and order of the Church Universal, are allowed wide freedom of opinion in all other matters". The principles

are then applied. Membership of the Church is through Baptism. The Faith of the Church is based upon the Old and New Testaments "which hold all that is necessary for salvation" and it accepts the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding the Faith. But there are important qualifications scattered here and there in the Constitutions, e.g. in 11.13 (refs. to 1952 Edition, Madras), dealing with unity within the C.S.I. the Constitution states:

"This (union) can only take place on the basis of freedom of opinion on debatable matters and respect for even large differences of opinion and practice, and it believes this freedom and mutual respect can be safeguarded, not by framing detailed regulations, but by assurances given and received in a spirit of confidence and love. The Church of South India therefore pledges itself that it will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience, either by Church authorities or by majorities, and will not, in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed. Neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed, or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made, either generally, or in particular cases, which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches."

This pledge seems to render meaningless those clauses in the Constitution which declare that freedom of opinion is allowed only on those matters which do not affect the substance of the Faith, for by the pledge the C.S.I. is bound to respect any opinion about matters of faith, however unorthodox, provided those opinions are held conscientiously. Again in III.6:

"It shall not be necessary that in answering questions with regard to their faith, candidates for baptism should use the actual words of either of these creeds in affirming their belief."

A protagonist of the C.S.I. defended this clause in a recent letter to *The Times*, interpreting it as a concession made to the illiteracy of the majority of Church members, for it has been found that the requirement of the repetition of phrases verbally memorised from the creed is not the best way of ensuring that the candidate knows what he is doing. One would have thought that the illiterates would find less difficulty in repeating the words of the creed after their own pastor than in giving an exegesis of their own. Besides, unless the pastor himself is illiterate it is hard to explain the clause in X.5:

"In the ordinary congregational worship of any congregation, no authority of the Church of South India shall forbid the use of the creeds or impose it against the will of the congregation—recitation of the Apostles' or Nicene Creed may be recommended, but such recitation shall not be compulsory."

After the Faith of the Church, the Sacraments are considered. These passages are masterpieces of compromise designed to give no offence either to High Anglicans or to extreme Protestants:

"The Church of South India believes that the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are means of grace through which God works in us . . . It has in experience been found best that one minister should lead the worship of the Church, and pronounce the words of consecration in the service of Holy Communion . . . It has been the custom of the Church that those

only should exercise this function who have received full and solemn commission from the Church to do so, this commission has ordinarily been given by the laying on of hands in ordination. The only indispensable conditions for the ministration of the grace of God in the Church are the unchangeable promise of God Himself and the gathering together of God's elect people . . . It is not open to anyone to limit the operation of God's grace to any particular channel, or to deny the reality of His grace when it is visibly manifest in the lives of Churches and individuals. . . No individual, and no one order in the Church can claim exclusive possession of this heavenly priesthood."

In II.10 the Constitution declares:

"It is a rule of order that the celebration of Communion shall be entrusted only to those who have, by ordination, received authority thereto."

Men are ordained into the C.S.I. by Episcopal ordination but the Constitution II.11 says:

"In making this provision for Episcopal ordination the C.S.I. declares that it is its function and determination in this manner to secure unification of the ministry, but that it does not involve any judgement upon the validity or regularity of any other form of the ministry, and the fact that other Churches do not follow the rule of Episcopal ordination will not in itself preclude it from holding relations of communion and fellowship with them."

The word "Presbyter" was deliberately chosen in preference to priest in order to exclude the notion of a sacrificing priesthood. The quotations given show that the ordination of presbyters is merely a point of Church order and apart from expediency there is no reason why they, rather than any other Church member, should conduct the Holy Communion service. But episcopal ordination is not strictly necessary. Non-episcopally ordained ministers who join the C.S.I. are not compelled to accept episcopal ordination and they may continue to act as ministers in the C.S.I. on an equal footing with the episcopally ordained. At first, this concession to the non-episcopally ordained was to be subject to revision after 1977, but in 1950 the Synod of the C.S.I. passed this resolution: "We have promised, at the end of 30 years, to give equal weight to the two principles", i.e. that the ministry of the C.S.I. shall be one and yet shall maintain full communion with its parent churches. This means that the C.S.I. will recognise, for the future, episcopally and non-episcopally ordained ministers who belong to any of the parent churches as having equally valid orders. Members of the C.S.I. will always be free to accept the ministrations and attend the services of any Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Methodist or Anglican minister and these ministers will be free, on the invitation of the C.S.I., to conduct services in South Indian Churches. This notion of the presbyterate as a group of officers commissioned for the administrative purposes of the organisation becomes even more explicit when the Constitution proceeds to treat of episcopacy, II.11:

"The C.S.I. accepts and will maintain the historic episcopate in a constitutional form. But this acceptance does not commit it to any particular interpretation of Episcopacy or to any particular view or belief concerning orders of the ministry, and it will not require the acceptance of any such particular interpretation or view as a necessary qualification for its ministry."

The Basis of Union is even more frank. It recognises diverse views and beliefs about the episcopacy among the uniting Churches. "For example, some regard episcopacy merely as a form of Church government . . . Others believe that episcopacy is of divine appointment, and that

episcopal ordination is an essential guarantee of the sacraments of the Church", but the C.S.I. does not commit itself to any particular interpretation.

As to the worship of the C.S.I., the Constitution II.12 "will retain for its congregations freedom either to use historic forms or not to do so".

In Church administration the lay element plays no small part, not only in each parish, but in the Diocesan Councils and even in Synod itself, where each diocese is represented by not fewer than two presbyters and four laymen. If matters of doctrine, Church membership, functions of presbyters or Church worship are to be discussed, the Bishops meet privately but their decisions do not become final till ratified by the whole Synod.

Anglican Relations with C.S.I.

Negotiations between the proposed C.S.I. and the Anglican Church continued intermittently from 1920-1943. In that year Archbishop Temple sanctioned the union of four of the Anglican dioceses in India in a united Church and he was prepared to sponsor the C.S.I. itself. However, he abandoned the scheme when the Anglican religious orders, allied with certain representative churchmen and prominent laymen represented that such action would be "condoning an act of schism" and they threatened that

"many hundred, we might say thousands (said to include 3,000 secular clergy) with strong lay support if driven to choose between their conscience and their present ecclesiastical allegiance would receive not only sympathy but aid in re-establishing a body which could claim with justice to be the legitimate heir of the authentic principles of our Church of England."

Four years later, however, when the C.S.I. was inaugurated, Dr. Fisher could say "we have applauded the great venture in reunion made by the Church of South India — and while recording certain reasons which prevent our entering yet into full communion with that Church, we promise to do all in our power to help it so to develop that full communion may be possible". The principal reasons preventing full intercommunion were given by a committee of theologians formed to advise the Archbishop in 1946, and consisted of six points which the C. of E. presented to the C.S.I. for reconsideration before any further steps towards union could be taken. The points included questions of the "credal orthodoxy" of the C.S.I., presumably asking for a clarification of the ambiguities in the Church's profession to hold the creeds while at the same time allowing free interpretation of them, and it also included questions on the Sacraments and on Synodical procedure, but the two most important questions were (1) further assurance on the ultimate relation of the C.S.I. to other Churches not episcopally ordered and (2) further assurance of the circumstances in which non-episcopally ordained ministers might continue to minister in the C.S.I. at the end of the 30-year period. In 1950 a Joint Committee of Anglican theologians was appointed to consider the South Indian replies to the six points. The Committee reported to the Convocations of Canterbury and York that though satisfied with the answers given to the first four points, the two most important points still

caused difficulty and the Joint Committee could not recommend that the orders of bishops, presbyters and deacons of the C.S.I. who had been episcopally consecrated and ordained since that Church was inaugurated, be recognised as valid, nor could it recommend that bishops and presbyters of the C.S.I. episcopally ordained before, at or since the union, should be permitted to celebrate the Communion Service in Anglican Churches in Britain. However, the Joint Committee proposed that the matter be reconsidered in five years' time.

In July of this year the matter was reconsidered and the debate naturally centred round the question "Can the orders of the C.S.I. be recognised as valid?". From the report of the debate in the Upper House of the Canterbury and York Convocations it appears that members were agreed that the "form" and "manner" (the Anglican term corresponding to our "matter") of the C.S.I. ordination services were essentially similar to those prescribed in the Anglican ordinal and all the bishops of the C.S.I. were either Anglican bishops or had been consecrated by Anglicans according to the correct manner and form. But the question was, could those bishops, in ordaining men for the C.S.I., have a valid intention? Can the Bishop intend to do what the Church has always done and at the same time ordain a man for a church which permits episcopally and non-episcopally ordained ministers to enjoy equal status, and permits its members full liberty of interpretation of the Old and New Testaments and of the Apostles' and Nicene Creed? Both Convocations decided, almost unanimously, that the ordaining bishop could have a valid intention. One of the speakers argued:

"The bishops in ordaining for the C.S.I. thought of themselves not as doing something new, but as continuing to do what the Church had always done in ordination. . . . Ever since the subject of the validity of Orders had begun to be formally considered in the Church, it had with increasing awareness been recognised how dangerous it was to require an intention beyond that of doing what the Church did in ordination, namely, continuing the Ministry which Our Lord instituted."

Both Convocations then passed the resolutions which have caused such a furore since. The following is a summary. Bishops, presbyters and deacons consecrated at, or after the inauguration of the C.S.I. are to be acknowledged true bishops, presbyters and deacons in the Church of God. Members of the C.S.I. may communicate in Anglican Churches when in England. All bishops and presbyters of the C.S.I. may preach in Anglican Churches, and, if episcopally ordained, may celebrate Holy Communion, provided that, if they are in England, they do so in Anglican Churches only. Bishops in England may lend parish churches to episcopally ordained ministers of the C.S.I. and they may there celebrate the South Indian liturgy. Anglicans, whether bishops, priests or layfolk, may attend the C.S.I. and there celebrate or communicate.

What is implied in the Anglican Recognition of the C.S.I.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in a public address in October, 1955 made the following statement to calm the widespread disquiet among Anglicans at the official recognition of the C.S.I.: "I say boldly that in all these matters the Church of England has not abated any single part

of its Catholic heritage". But if the C. of E. "has abated no single part of its Catholic heritage", what follows about the Anglican conception of "its Catholic heritage"? As we have seen, the speakers in the July Convocation argued that as they were satisfied as to the credal orthodoxy of the C.S.I. and as its episcopally ordained ministers were ordained according to manner and form (essentially similar to that) of the Anglican ordinal, by bishops whose intention could not be doubted, therefore, episopally ordained ministers of the C.S.I. should be recognised as true presbyters of the Church. But the Anglicans recognise that the "form" of ordination does not consist in mere words, as though the words in themselves possessed some kind of magical quality, for they accept the C.S.I. "form", not because it is word for word the same as their own, but because it is essentially similar. It is, therefore, the meaning to be attached to the form which is all important. A heretical sect which does not accept the essential meaning which the Church attaches to the form, but which wishes to continue having an episcopally ordained ministry, may do one of two things, either (1) change the wording of the form to express the new and heretical meaning (and this is what happened in the Anglican Ordinal of 1552 which excluded all references to the priest's power to transubstantiate and offer) or (2) retain the wording of the Catholic form but attach a different meaning to the words. Anglican supporters of the C.S.I. maintain that the "form" used in that Church is essentially the same as that of the C. of E., whence it follows that there is no essential difference between bishop and presbyter as expressed in the Constitutions of the C.S.I. and bishop and presbyter in the C. of E. Presbyter means, as we have seen, a senior officer of the Church organisation whose right to administer the Sacraments is only "a rule of order" in the Church. He is not endowed with any Divine character whereby he alone can offer sacrifice. When the C.S.I. ordains a presbyter, it is commissioning an Elder, that is the meaning which the constitution attaches to the form. By recognising that form as essentially similar to their own, Anglicans must hold that there is no essential difference between an elder and a priest, and if they have abated nothing of their Catholic heritage, they must maintain that the Church has never made such a distinction. Bishops, too, in the C.S.I. are mere overseers, the literal meaning of the word. Their appointment is merely a form of Church government which has, by experience, been found the best means of preserving order in the Church. Anglicans, by recognising bishops consecrated into the C.S.I. as true bishops, are committed to the same view. It is small wonder that the resolutions passed by Canterbury and York in July of this year have caused such disquiet within the Anglican body itself.

SOME RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE IN SUMMARY AND REVIEW

(i) THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

Towards the Definition of a Sacrament. Bernard Leeming, S.J. (*A summary based on the main arguments of Ch. XI and Ch. XVII of the shortly forthcoming "Principles of Sacramental Theology". By kind permission of the author.*)

WHEN St. Thomas said that the sacraments were "in genere signi" he was only remarking on what had been a common doctrine in the West since the time of St. Augustine. When we hear of something being classified according to genus we almost automatically wonder what is the species, what is its specific difference, in other words what is its definition. In the matter of the definition of the sacraments however a difficulty immediately arises; the sacraments are held to be practical signs and this would appear to put them outside their genus; for many, it is axiomatic that a sign can do nothing except signify. Perhaps in framing the definition of a sacrament we may tend to approach the question too aprioristically. Is it not possible and legitimate to make a definition which is dependent on positive sources for its elements? It seems clear that it was thus that the definition was originally hammered out.

Previous to St. Augustine the symbolic principle of the sacraments had been established. St. Paul underlines this symbolism in Baptism (Rom 6, 3-14), in the Eucharist (I Cor 10, 16-22), in Marriage (Eph 5, 22-34). St. Ignatius of Antioch made the Eucharist the basis of his exhortation to unity among Christians since the Eucharist is the sacrament of unity with Christ, of unity with each other. The symbolism in Baptism, in the Eucharist and in the anointings, is most copiously developed by the Greeks. They used the word to comprise both the sacraments and what we should call sacramentals, and it indicated something real but mysterious. While there was no classification of the Christian rites, there was this concept of external rites which at once signified spiritual things and, in the signification, partly hid and partly contained deeper spiritual realities. In a somewhat similar way the word *sacramentum* as used in the Latin Church before Augustine by Origen and Tertullian, meant both sacrament and sacramental, and in addition bears the possible meaning of an "oath", "initiation", and "sacrifice". Tertullian clearly teaches the symbolic principle. "The flesh is washed that the soul may be purified; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed that the soul may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed by the imposition of hands that the soul may be enlightened by the spirit . . ."

It was however Augustine who did most to develop the sacramental concept. He laid emphasis on the fact that the sacrament was a sacred sign; "signs when applied to divine things are called sacraments". Secondly, he taught that the sign must in some way represent the thing

signified. Thirdly, some of these signs are efficacious in a wonderful way. Finally, Augustine's distinction between the visible form and the invisible grace became famous; "if the minister is evil God effects through him the visible form of the sacraments, but He Himself is the invisible grace". In criticism however, it must be said that Augustine did not affirm adequately the efficacy of the sacraments nor the Dominical institution, and consequently there is no clear division in theory between the sacraments and the sacramentals. Nevertheless, his definition of a sacrament as a sign fructified in the great age of scholasticism.

In the twelfth century Hugh of St. Victor pointed out that the general definition "a sign of a sacred thing" was inadequate, as such a definition would be equally applicable to the scriptures, statues, paintings. He suggested that the interpretation of the meaning of the word should be stressed rather than the mere verbal definition. He proffered a descriptive definition. "A sacrament is a corporeal or material element set before the external senses, representing by similitude, and signifying by institution and containing by sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace." While this says much, as a definition it is still unsatisfactory. Hugh appears to make the sacrament consist in the material element and not even in the application to the recipient. Moreover "some invisible and spiritual grace" is too vague a term and would be equally applicable to any sacramental.

The unknown author of the *Summa Sententiarum*, writing before 1148, takes the definition much further. A sacrament is the "visible form of the invisible grace within it, which grace the sacrament itself confers. For it is not only the sign of a holy thing but its efficacy". It should be noted that the author goes on to insist that the sacraments signify not only by positive institution but also represent the thing by some likeness. Again, in the middle of the twelfth century, Peter Lombard gave a definition of a sacrament which fitted all and only the seven sacraments of the Church. "A sacrament," he says, "is such a sign of God's grace and such a form of invisible grace as to bear its likeness and to exist as its cause." The Lombard's teaching was accepted almost immediately and universally.

But it will have been noticed that so far the sacraments have all been described as in some way productive of grace. There might well be some discussion about what exactly was meant by grace in each context but it seems reasonable to take the term as meaning what we should today call sanctifying grace. But there are obvious objections to such a definition. Sacraments are unfortunately received validly but unworthily. They are none the less sacraments for all that, indeed it is in this that the sacrilege lies. If then it is possible to have the sacrament validly received it follows that in at least some of the sacraments the primary effect is not that of conferring grace. Similarly the sacraments naturally and of their own intrinsic power revive. But if the grace which is revived is truly the grace of the sacrament unworthily received, and if the sacramental sign is already long passed away, it is difficult to see that the primary effect of a sacrament is to confer grace.

At this point we have approached the rather controversial ground of sacramental causality. Without wishing to settle a very complicated matter out of hand by setting up men of straw, it may be suggested that if sacraments are to be defined, or rather described, by their effects, we should try to include in our definition as complete an account as possible of what a sacrament does.

Fr. Leeming suggests the following definition. "A sacrament is an efficacious sign of a particular kind of union with Christ in the Church by which the recipient receives grace if rightly disposed." This definition puts in the first place not grace but an ontological union with the mystical Body of Christ as the primary and infallible effect of the sacraments. This effect necessarily follows their valid reception. Thus is explained the question of sacraments valid, but fruitless of grace. The effect of incorporation into the Mystical Body may seem a strange consequence of Baptism received without due disposition, but it is really no different from the doctrine that St. Augustine taught in his controversy against the Donatists. Or, to put the same point from the other side, when a penitent who has already been justified by an act of perfect contrition receives absolution from his grave sins, what is effected by that absolution? Surely not sanctifying grace which he has already received through perfect contrition, but rather the right to go to Holy Communion; that is, a full reconciliation with the visible Body of the Church. Again, in the sacrament of Penance the effect of sacramental absolution of venial sins is surely to repair the damage caused to the Body by such sins, as Fr. Vermeersch points out.

If one takes the view that the sacraments do not merely give grace as such, but give special graces, and indeed remain as permanent causes of grace rather than as mere juridic rights to grace, it is easy to see how a priest, let us say, precisely because he is constituted a priest by union with Christ in the Church, can receive the exact *gratia status* he requires throughout his ministerial life.

Moreover, Fr. Leeming's suggested definition has this to commend it that it explains the contractual element which is present in many of the sacraments and which is often rather neglected. For rights and obligations come from the inner meaning of the sacraments themselves: this is perhaps specially clear in Baptism, Orders and Matrimony whose obligations and right are neither greater nor less because the sacramental grace has been received. It is the position in the Church which confers of itself the rights and imposes the obligations.

If then the effect of the sacraments is primarily to confer a certain state or dignity in the Body of the Church (and this seems to explain well the practice of confirming dying babies) how do the sacraments produce grace. Precisely by putting the recipient in that order in which grace is connatural by a practical sign instituted by Christ who thereby indicates His will that the recipient should have the grace which is signified, the sacraments do cause grace *non ponentibus obicem*.

Lachlan Hughes, S.J.

"*Sacraments and Worship*": Liturgy and Doctrinal Development of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. Edited with commentary by Paul F. Palmer, S.J., S.T.D. The Newman Press: Westminster, Maryland, 1955. 227 pp.

THIS is the first in a series of volumes designed to present in English translation the basic texts and documents which have shaped and continue to control Catholic theological teaching."

It is a compilation of texts — in both chronological and topical order — showing the clear and constant tradition of the Church on the three sacraments which are most nearly bound up with Christian worship: Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist.

The vast material is presented under five headings. The first two sections are concerned with the early rites of initiation and the early Eucharistic liturgies. They extend from the *Didache* to the *Gelasian Sacramentary* (c. 700), where the basic ceremonies and prayers of the present Roman liturgy are already given in detail.

The doctrinal implications of the liturgies described so far, are developed in the documents of the following sections.

The third section centres on the sacramental system. Although systematic sacramental theology was not sufficiently elaborated until the twelfth century, its basic principles are as old as the Church. The editor shows this by excerpts from the writings of the Fathers, from St. Ignatius to St. Augustine. The following texts cover ground extending up to the *Mystici Corporis* of Pius XII.

The last two sections deal with the Holy Eucharist as a sacrament and as a sacrifice. These too include documents ranging from the earliest times to the encyclicals of the recent Popes.

In addition to the quotations from the Fathers, Popes, Councils — from Nicea to the Vatican — and from the writings of St. Thomas, we are given citations from the works of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melancthon and Cranmer. These extracts from the Reformers show how completely they had broken with tradition and by their very contrast make the Catholic doctrine stand out in sharper relief.

A valuable feature of this book is the historical and theological notes which the editor provides as an introduction to the different groups of documents. English speaking students of theology will be grateful to Fr. Palmer for making available to them these varied series of texts in such a handy form.

Enrique Portilla, S.J.

* * * *

Die Herrlichkeit der Sakramente, by Georges Cardinal Grente. Translated from "Magnificence des Sacraments" by Prof. G. Brinktrine. 2nd Edition. Paderborn 1951. 296 pp.

THE quality of this work is indicated by the rapidity with which it reached a second edition in its original German, and also translations. The key to its undoubted popularity lies in the author's setting out to give not so much a review of the history of sacramental theology,

or the solutions of disputed questions, as a clear and up-to-date explanation, intended primarily for lay-folk, of the *Roman Catechism*. This difficult task he skilfully achieves, succeeding at the same time in engaging the personal faith of the reader, and in relating all that is said, to Christian doctrine as a whole.

Beginning from the natural striving of all men towards the source of order and harmony, the reader is led to a personal knowledge of Our Lord and to the acknowledgement of Christ's grace: the divine filiation. This is the plan of redemption and sanctification which is brought to its fulfilment in the institution of the sacraments. Hence the essence of the sacraments is to confer grace and prepare the individual and the whole of mankind for their eternal destination. It is by means of this perspective that sacramental theology and personal sanctification are presented as one thing.

The same starting point leads easily enough to other parts of Christian doctrine; to Apologetics, to the doctrine of the Incarnation, Redemption and grace. All these, along with relevant practical considerations from moral, ascetical and liturgical theology are presented by the author in their relation to sacramental theology. The style of presentation, moreover, is far from being merely theoretical. It is rather an intimate discussion with a man of great faith, pastoral experience and awareness of the problems of people of his time.

There is however perhaps one such problem which is passed over rather lightly. Cardinal Grente's main aim in this work is, it seems, to restate the objective necessity of the sacraments from scripture and tradition, whereas many people nowadays are not thoroughly satisfied by this alone, and are rather, inclined to emphasise sanctification by personal love of Our Lord. Hence it is necessary to show, perhaps a little less indirectly than the author does, how intimate is the connection between this love and the sacraments, so that the danger of too legal an attitude towards them be averted.

The answer to this particular question is, however, indicated when he shows sacramental life to be one with Christian doctrine as well as with the personal knowledge of Our Lord gained through the reception of sacramental grace.

George Vass, S.J.

* * * *

Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia Vol. 4: Pierre le Chantre: Summa de Sacramentis et animae consiliis. Premiere Partie. Texte inedit publie et annote par Jean-Albert Duguaquier. Louvain, 1954. pp.204 — xciii.

THE only work of Peter the Chanter (d 1197) ever published in its entirety was the *Verbum Abbreviatum* (1639). M. J. A. Duguaquier has now undertaken the publication of the *Summa de Sacramentis et Animae Consiliis*. The first part, *De Sacramentis legalibus, De Baptismo, De Confirmatione, De Extrema Unctione, De Eucharista*, was published in 1954.

In a long (93 pages) and scientific introduction he establishes the relative authority of the eight existing manuscripts. They vary considerably: some are mere summaries, probably done by Peter's pupils, some glossaries or recasts of the original work. Then he gives the text of cod 276, *Bibliothèque communale, Troyes*, adding as apparatus criticus the variants of the other codices.

In this work Peter the Chanter appears (as he mainly was) more a moralist than a dogmatic theologian. He wrote at a time when the distinction between the different branches of Theology was not yet made, and in dealing with his subject he mixes up dogmatic and moral problems. The great interest of this *Summa de Sacramentis* lies in the history of pre-scholastic theology. Through his book we can have an insight into the theological trend of the 12th century. There are mentioned in his work a number of medieval customs in relation to the Sacraments and sometimes curious dogmatic ideas. For example, he gives us as the then current view that "*plures (sacerdotes) sunt necessarii in sacerdotis consecratione*" because of the words of the Apostle: "*per impositionem manuum presbyterii*".

Peter the Chanter discards commonplace problems, and several times states that he only proposes to deal with unsolved, interesting questions. With great common sense he explicitly declines to treat the quaint theological cases so fashionable in his time. Yet he shows a deep sense of intellectual humility. When the solution to a problem is not clear he never tries to impose his own opinion. Time and again there occur in his work phrases like these: "*Tutius est de his hesitare pie, quam aliquid temere definire*"; "*De hoc etsi possit aliquid sane dici, tutius tamen est omnino subticere*".

However, he could not escape altogether the spirit of his time and sometimes falls into casuistic disquisitions. One example:

"May the materials of a destroyed church be used for ordinary use? — No. May these materials be used to make fire for the poor — Probably not. If these materials happened to catch fire, might the poor warm themselves at the blaze? — Probably yes."

But on the whole Peter the Chanter avoids these digressions and his work is that of a sound moral theologian of his day.

Anthony Molina, S.J.

(ii) PENANCE

The Sacrament of Penance and St. Cyprian's *De Lapsis*. By Maurice Bévenot, S.J. (*Summarised from Theological Studies*, 16 (1955) 175 by James Giblin, S.J.)

ST. CYPRIAN in his *De Lapsis* seems to deny that the Church ever forgives sins and to maintain that heaven is closed to all, save the martyrs, until the General Judgement. Father Bévenot approaches these and kindred problems by a review of the events recorded in Cyprian's correspondence during the eighteen months preceding this letter. In the light of the historical situation he is able to identify various delinquents and their delinquencies. This gives the clue to Cyprian's real intentions and to the true meaning of his startling statements.

Cyprian's problem was how to uphold the Church's discipline regarding absolution. It was a recognised practice that those who had suffered torture for the faith and were expecting martyrdom could recommend penitent sinners to the bishop for early reconciliation. But some of these "martyrs" had been acting indiscreetly; they had been issuing their recommendations without proper investigation and without indicating the beneficiaries nominatim; five rebel priests encouraged these excesses and used them as a warrant for their own too-easy absolution; the lapsed, thus emboldened, and unwilling to submit to the ordinary penitential process, clamoured for absolution as a right, maintaining that the "martyrs" had granted reconciliation to all. Cyprian met them with the reply that such wholesale remission which blots out both sin and its punishment is only possible in baptism and this is Christ's doing; to suppose that the martyrs can do the same for post-baptismal sins is to put them on a level with Christ himself. Thus when he says "None but the Lord, who suffered for our sins, can forgive them" and the like, he is not denying the Church's power to forgive sins under proper conditions; he is denying the validity of satisfactionless absolution such as the five priests were dispensing on the alleged authority of the martyrs.

At the end of chapter 17 Cyprian maintains that the merits of the martyrs will have effect only at the day of judgement. In proof of this he quotes a text from the Apocalypse (6, 10) which portrays the martyrs as sitting below the altar of God not yet occupying their judges' thrones and thus in no position to defend others, i.e., to remit the sins of the lapsed. Hence it is argued that for Cyprian the Church's reconciliation was merely provisional; that the only real judgement of sin was reserved to Christ at the last day, before which no one, save the martyrs, would enter heaven. But, in the *De Mortalitate*, he describes death as a reunion with our loved ones in the happiness of heaven, and in the *Ad Fortunatum* he says: "Without stay of time is the reward given where God is judge". Moreover the supposed exception in the case of the martyrs would involve their not being judged at all since at the day of judgement they would be enjoying already the reward which they received at martyrdom. Yet Christ will surely be judging them when He "confesses those who have confessed Him". "When the Day of Judgement comes" is, then, simply Cyprian's way of saying "when we come to be judged". But this does not imply that the sinner's cause is still in abeyance, not even during this life. Cyprian strongly insists elsewhere that the reconciled sinner is once more safely bestowed in the Church and this precisely because "extra Ecclesiam nulla salus". By his reconciliation he is given hope of salvation, put on a level with the others and considered worthy to approach the Eucharist. This implies a state of grace and true absolution. No doubt he will be judged after death, but so will the others. The fact that he will be judged no more calls in question the efficacy of his reconciliation than the fact that the others will be judged calls into question the faith and devotion of their lives. It is unfair to press any of Cyprian's expressions in this passage of the *De Lapsis*. They were but the rhetorical scaffolding for his main purpose, and one can very much doubt whether he means to do more than

suggest that even a martyr in heaven cannot have it all his own way, especially since, on other occasions, he allowed great value to the merits of the martyrs here and now. While his troublesome flock are pestering him with "what the martyrs said" he is exploiting to the best of his ability a text from Scripture which describes the martyrs as "under the altar", pitifully praying to be avenged.

Father Bévenot's interpretation of two remaining difficult phrases viz. "non servasse sententiam" and "Domini praecepta" brings out clearly the coherence and direction of Cyprian's thought and intention. The former is a reference to the solemn warning given by Christ "to confess those who confess Him etc.". By their behaviour the rebel priests and their fellow-travellers are disregarding this decree. Cyprian points out that Christ has told us beforehand what His Judgement will be; we must respect it. If we have lapsed we must appeal now — before the coming judgement — to His mercy, and appease Him by our penance. The martyrs would want this and if the five priests counsel otherwise they do so without the martyrs' authority. Their activities also involve subverting the Church's discipline since they override the "Domini praecepta", a phrase, colourless in itself, which took on a precise meaning from Cyprian's constant use of it in reference to the penitential process and the bishop's authority behind it. Cyprian is unwilling to believe that the "martyrs" ever suggested contravening these "Domini praecepta". And he adds that, in any case, we know that the saints of the Old Law did not always have their requests granted by God in spite of their merits.

* * * *

Penance and Charity. By S. Lyonnet, S.J. (*Summarised from Verbum Domini*, 33 (1955) 95 and 30 (1952) 92, by Anthony Bex, S.J.)

THE main point of these two articles is that we have lost the primitive spirit in our attitude to penance in general, and to fasting in particular. The teaching of the early Fathers seems, clearly, to have insisted on the necessity of linking up our penance with charity. Penance was undoubtedly, for them, only a means to an end. They constantly stressed this idea in the many sermons they preached for the good humble folk of their day.

Texts are cited which date from very early times, but the most valuable and beautiful of all are taken from the sermons of St. Leo the Great. When he preached to his people during Lent and during the Ember Day fasts which preceded Christmas, he constantly impressed upon them the Christian motive for Penance. Fasting, he insisted, would only give strength against sin, if accompanied by the benevolence of charity, and the prudent exercise of works of mercy. Fasting without almsgiving, he says, is not so much a purification of the soul, as simply an affliction of the flesh. He inveighed against the very human failing of storing up the good things which were put aside during the Lenten fast, and which were partaken of with self-complacent enjoyment when the fasting period was over. Rather should the abstinence of those who fast, result in the feeding of the poor. "Fiat refectio pauperis abstinencia

ieiunantis." Sts. Augustine and Gregory the Great and others among the Fathers put forward similar ideas, and the early liturgies, both Leonine and Gallican, crystallise them.

Unfortunately they became so crystallised as to lose power and motive force in the lives of Christians, so that it is with a little surprise, perhaps, that we turn to the present day Roman liturgy of Lent to find that they lie dormant there — ready like the bones the prophet spoke of, to have the breath of life imparted to them.

The very first collect of Ash Wednesday certainly springs to life when the phrases "congrua pietate" and "secura devotione" are considered in the light of St. Leo's use of them in his sermons. Those words have lost their original force, and have often assumed sentimental sugary associations. But for St. Leo "pietas", when applied to God, meant His generous mercy to humanity and His goodness to those He created. Piety in us must be in us a reflection of that of our Father: a loving care for the needs of our brethren. "Devotio" meant for Leo an attitude of will determined to serve God faithfully and to imitate his goodness. Now we can really appreciate the meaning of the Ash Wednesday collect:—

"Grant, O Lord, to your faithful, (the grace) to undertake these holy and solemn fasts with all the fraternal charity which is due to them, and may they carry them out with a firm determination to devote themselves to your service." (Trans. Abbe Guillaume).

Further instances of the same trends can be found in other parts of the Roman liturgy, but that one important example must here suffice.

That it is not only desirable, but according also to the mind of the Church that we should revive the primitive spirit in this matter of penance, is shown from an interesting text in Pius XII's allocution in 1950, on the occasion of the definition of the Assumption. We live at a period in history when the ancient fasts are no longer possible for various reasons. But the Pope points out that expiation of sin by penance and mortification is never old-fashioned, and that we should imitate our early forbears who, "et ieiunando et abstinendo a licitis quoque rebus, opiferae caritatis fontes aluerunt". Although that phrase received little comment in the writings of those who spoke about the allocution, it was in reality, a challenge which we would do well to consider prayerfully and put before our people during the coming Lent.

* * * *

The Priest and the Unconscious, by Ringel and van Lun. Mercier Press, 1955, 6/-.

QUITE an extensive literature already exists on the differences and similarities between the roles of priest and psychotherapist; so extensive indeed that, as far as present progress in psychology permits, all the obvious inferences would seem to have been drawn. *The Priest and the Unconscious*, however, while considering this question yet again, has more than avoided triteness. This is because the book is the product of co-operation of exactly the sort that it is out to advocate: that, namely, between a priest as able at the apt expression of funda-

mentals as Fr. van Lun, and a psychotherapist with the analytic skill of Dr. Ringel.

The restrictions imposed by Canon Law on the activity of priests in the fields of medicine and psychotherapy, while grounded on the sacredness of the priestly state, are at the same time very much in keeping with the requirements of those professions. If a medically unqualified priest were to attempt to practice psychotherapy, for instance, he might well, as the authors point out, find himself unable to deal with the physical complaints into which his patients might tend to withdraw in order to escape his authority. He would also be liable to get caught up in the heightened relationships which develop in the course of many an analysis — transferences in Freud's terms — and linked with this, the identification in one person of therapist and priest could be prejudicial to the patient's subsequent religious life.

Whence comes the need, so strongly urged once more in this work, for co-operation between a priest who is alive to the outward manifestations of psychological disorder, and a doctor who knows of what can be known about the boundaries between nature and grace. What such team work can achieve is well illustrated in this book by a series of cases of considerable interest, both of a general nature, and, in particular, on hysteria and obsession. By far the most worthwhile feature of the work, however, is the chapter entitled "The Psychology of Faith", where the authors present cases — and in some of them the results of treatment as well — where neurotic disorders led to the abandonment of faith. Here is vivid evidence for the manner in which personal relationships can, in a manner not evident to the unaided patient, interfere with and even for a time destroy belief. While it is evident that not every such case would imply an explicit and malicious rejection of God, yet the possibilities for good afforded by the services of analyst and priest to those thus afflicted, are manifest. Such is the relevance of this study today that the more ample work on the same matter promised by the authors can be eagerly awaited.

Whilst the fact that two authors rather than one contributed to this book is just perceptible in slightly varying evaluations within it of the present day systems of depth psychology — the more theoretical early chapters are rather favourable to Adlerian conceptions, while the subsequent case analyses have a stronger Freudian slant — this is more than offset by the balance of the whole. Needlessly elementary discussion of the principles of depth psychology is avoided, and the presence of genuine and relevant case material is an earnest that both speculation and observation have together made this study possible.

George Croft, S.J.

(iii) OTHER SACRAMENTS

The Confirmation of Dying Infants. By Bernard Leeming, S.J. (*Summarised from Clergy Review, 40 (1955) 641 by Gerard Marsden, S.J.*)

IN the early days of the Church, certainly in the East, Baptism and Confirmation were given together as Christian initiation ceremonies. As a result early writings, even of Western authors, give examples which

show the effects of the combined ceremony rather than of Baptism or Confirmation taken separately. For them, the initiation ceremonies as a whole put a seal or mark upon the soul which may be compared to the branding of animals to manifest ownership, to the branding or tattooing of Roman soldiers, to Jewish circumcision, to the marking of the door posts of the Israelites that the angel of vengeance may pass by, to the image and inscription of a coin, to the sealing up of money bags to ensure their safety, and to the sealing up of the senses against the entry of evil spirits.

What was the purpose of this seal on the soul? It marked the Christian with Christ's own mark and so made him safe from the assaults of demons, and gave him the protection of angels who, seeing the mark of Christ, would revere it and hasten to help him who bore it.

It is true that the above examples make no distinction between the seal or character given by Baptism and that given by Confirmation. The Fathers, however, did see that the gifts given in Baptism are not essentially incapable of enhancement or enlargement and they tried to express this idea metaphorically. After Baptism the Holy Ghost comes upon the Baptised to perfect, to fulfil, to consummate, to supplement, to complete or increase the gifts of Baptism. They saw Baptism as a document signed but not yet sealed with the official seal of a University or Government. They saw Baptism as a contract with God, still awaiting the ultimate seal of ratification. In modern metaphor we might refer to Baptism as a letter signed and stamped but not yet sealed with wax and registered. Or again we might see Baptism and Confirmation figured in the custom of the Royal Family: the oldest male child is heir to the throne by birth; but he receives greater dignity when invested as Prince of Wales.

Does Confirmation merely add dignity to the baptised person? No. The authors give many examples of its more practical effects. Faustus of Riez writing in the 6th century says: "Military proceedings require that when an Emperor has received a man into the number of his soldiers, he should not only put his mark on the man, but should also equip him with arms suitable for battle. So in the case of the man baptised, the benediction of Confirmation is like a giving of arms. You have found a soldier; find him the implements of warfare. Is it of any use for a parent to bequeath a vast property to his little child unless he takes care also to provide him with a guardian?" And he adds: "So before the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles are terrified even to denial; but after his visitation they are armed even to martyrdom, despising deliverance".

And yet again: "According to this we are redeemed through Christ; but through the Holy Ghost we are enlightened with the gift of spiritual wisdom, are built up, instructed, furnished, completed, so as to be able to hear that voice of the Holy Ghost. 'I will give thee understanding and I will instruct thee in this way in which thou shalt go.' (Ps 31, 8)".

Summarising the early evidence, Fr. Leeming says: "Thus there is sufficient foundation in patristic literature for the idea that Confirmation gives a special status in the Church, that of a fully-acknowledged and

equipped Christian, and that the graces given will be appropriate to the status'.

The full development of the theology of the Sacraments was reserved for the 12th and 13th centuries. Questions and answers became more precise. Peter of Poitiers (d.1205) answered the question about the relative superiority of Baptism and Confirmation by a comparison between water and wine, the former being more necessary, the latter, better, worthier and more precious. Far more important, however, are the repeated exhortations of the necessity of receiving Confirmation. Hugh of St. Victor (d.1141) writes: "Thus they must fear who lost the presence of the bishop through negligence and did not receive the imposition of the hand, lest perhaps they may be damned, since they ought to have hastened while they were able."

"About adults," writes Fr. Leeming, "practically every known theologian of the period is in agreement with Hugh of St. Victor. Infants, however, made a troublesome problem. It was traditional teaching that they would be saved without Confirmation . . . ; yet there was obvious uneasiness about them dying unconfirmed. Robert Pullen says that they ought to be confirmed when they are little, and that, if they die unconfirmed, adults will be blameworthy if, through slothfulness, they omitted to have them confirmed."

In Confirmation is the sacrament which strengthens the soul in defending and spreading the faith, why give it to a dying infant who will never need to defend or spread the faith? Even if Confirmation gives an influx of grace and a new adult status in the hierarchy of the Church, how can we reconcile infancy with this adult state? It was St. Thomas who solved the problem in Part III of the Summa, Q72, art 8:—

"As stated above, man is spiritually advanced by this sacrament to perfect age. Now the intention of nature is that everyone born corporally should come to perfect age; yet this is sometimes hindered by reason of the corruptibility of the body and is forestalled by death. But much more is it God's intention to bring all things to perfection, since nature shares in this intention: hence it is written 'The works of God are perfect' (Dt 32, 4). Now the soul, to which spiritual birth and spiritual age belong, is immortal; and just as it can in old age attain to spiritual birth, so can it attain to perfect spiritual age in youth or childhood; because the various ages of the body do not affect the soul. Therefore this sacrament should be given to all."

Since the time of St. Thomas there may have been a certain regression among theologians in understanding the importance of Confirmation. The re-introduction of the administration of Confirmation to dying infants may have come as a surprise, but Fr. Leeming assures us that "the present practice, however, introduces nothing new in the Church's teaching, but only carries into easier application the principles and teachings of the great theologians of the 13th century, who in turn were fully grounded in the still earlier tradition".

Das Bonum Prolis als Eheziel bei Thomas Sanchez, S.J. und Basilius Ponce de Leon, O.E.S.A. By Felix Trösch. Innsbruck, 1955. 81 pp.

THIS purely historical investigation by Trösch into the divergent views of two 17th century moralists about the primary end of marriage, again takes up a problem that has attracted much attention in the last twenty years. Present day moral teaching, says the author, not infrequently combines both elements of what was at one time considered an open question.

This fact is aptly illustrated when the author outlines the opinions of Sanchez and Ponce in clear relief against each other on four main questions concerning the *bonum prolis*; firstly, the nature of marriage and the order of its ends; secondly, the necessary objective conditions for marriage with regard to the *bonum prolis*; thirdly, the subject of the matrimonial contract with regard to the same; and fourthly, the intention towards the *bonum prolis* as a necessary condition for the moral rectitude of marriage.

According to Sanchez, mutual *amicitia* is a real and intrinsic end of marriage. But, unlike Ponce, he does not put this before *propagatio prolis*. As against the more biological conception of Sanchez, Ponce considers rather the community of persons. Arguing that the essential relationship in matrimony is not so much the corporal as the spiritual union, he distinguishes two sorts of union: *ad caste vivendum* and *in ordine ad copulam*. Trösch suggests that although there is much to commend this change of emphasis on the respective ends of marriage, it was only brought about by Ponce's playing down the essential relation to the physical that Sanchez had stressed.

The opposition of the two different systems has been very clearly brought out by this work, as also has been the limited objective of the author. He is not attempting to give a final solution, but simply to show the internal problems and tendencies in the Christian doctrine of marriage.

Joseph Frickel, S.J.

* * * *

Is Extreme Unction the Sacrament of the Dying? By F. Meurant. (Summarised from *La Vie Spirituelle*, No. 404 (1955) 242, by Michael McMorrow, S.J.)

A MOVEMENT of opinion came into existence two years ago with the object of securing greater elasticity in the conditions required for the reception of Extreme Unction. Hospital chaplains and sick people of various categories would like to see this sacrament given to anyone suffering from serious illness, curable or otherwise. Is there any justification for this movement?

The traditional tendency has been to regard Extreme Unction as the sacrament of the dying, and, though the Church condemns the practice of delaying its administration until the patient is unconscious, yet it seems to be taken for granted that her doctrine is that its proper effect is to give strength to face death, while penance and the Eucharist are

considered sufficient for the needs of the soul during sickness. Many see in this restrictive notion an error resulting in injustice to the sick.

Catholic theology teaches that the chief purpose of Extreme Unction is spiritual purification, complementary to that of Penance, which wipes out or diminishes the last remains of sin and brings with it spiritual and bodily strength. It should be given to anyone who is seriously ill or in danger of death, that is, when death is as probable as recovery. If, however, it were the sacrament of the dying, subsequent recovery of the anointed person would indicate that the sacrament had been given without due cause, but theology does not hold this; likewise it ought in that case to be given to all who are about to die, e.g. prisoners under sentence of death. The fact that it is not given to such people shows that it is the sacrament, not of the dying as such, but of the sick, intended to give help in sickness.

A glance at the liturgy of the sacrament exposes even more clearly the error of the present day conception. In the prayers after the anointing, the priest asks God to restore the sick person to full spiritual and bodily health, so that he may resume his work for the glory of God. Now if it were morally certain that he was to die soon, such a prayer would be out of place, for the Church cannot ask officially or ritually for a miracle.

Psychologically, the present attitude underestimates both the trial of sickness and the concomitant moral suffering. Just as Our Lord underwent a double agony, a moral one in the garden and a physical one of the cross, so the sick person often endures a moral agony, more painful (because more conscious) than the final agony of death. It is worth pointing out that God sent an angel to Christ in the garden but not on Calvary.

That triple error has distorted the true spirit and purpose of Extreme Unction. The sacrament does confer the grace of a happy death, but only in consequence of the dispositions it has induced during the time of sickness. The objection that early reception exposes the recipient to a diminution or loss of its effect does not hold against the advantages of such reception or against the disadvantages and the risk of excessive delay.

The fundamental problem is to determine the limits within which the sacrament may be administered. The Council of Trent decreed that there had to be "danger of death": this has been exaggerated to mean imminence of death, and so what was originally intended to avoid one abuse has led to another and a worse one, namely excessive delay.

Modern medicine ought to be able to supply a suitable criterion; for example, an illness which affects the whole organism can be distinguished from a localised indisposition: the former is a serious illness, even though still curable, and justifies anointing. To extend the administration of Extreme Unction to all who are seriously ill would be a better and more fruitful practice than the one which prevails in the Latin Church today, and it would help to show that God makes use of the trial of sickness as a means of sanctification and closer union with Christ suffering. Practical instances afford ample evidence of the need for reform here.

The present interpretation shows how difficult it is for the human mind, even with the light of faith, to understand our Saviour's intentions. But excessive respect for the sacraments, which after all are for man and not vice versa, is detrimental to the welfare of souls, and narrow formalism keeps away from the sacraments precisely those who need them most. The attitude towards the blessed Eucharist was similar, until Pius X's decree on frequent communion.

In the early centuries of Christianity, the position was quite different; the notion of Extreme Unction as a preparation for death only appears in the 12th century. The Council of Trent decided that it was the sacrament of the sick, but, in order to avoid abuses, imposed the condition of danger of death; the effect of this was only to reinforce that very notion, though the Code of 1917 suppressed the mention of imminence of death contained in the old Roman ritual. The clause "danger of death" is, it would seem, a purely disciplinary one, aimed at excluding abuses: there seems to be no reason therefore why the Church could not admit that it is present in any real illness, thus making of Extreme Unction the sacrament of all the sick.

A further objection to the present view is that it associates the priest with the undertaker instead of treating him as one who is capable of giving powerful help to both soul and body. Again, because of the progress of medicine, illnesses which are in themselves serious are treated as devoid of danger, and so the patient is not given Extreme Unction; this attitude is not justified, for though the illness may indeed be curable, the patient may not be able to bear the treatment and may be carried off suddenly.

A right understanding of the value of Extreme Unction and of the moral strain caused by illness would substitute the fear of excessive delay for the fear of early anointing, and would urge that the sick be not deprived of the benefits of the sacrament.

The Holy Father has the authority to proclaim, if he sees fit, a broader interpretation, one which, while respecting the doctrine of Trent and the liturgy, would take into further consideration the rights and needs of souls, and would assist the priest in his apostolate.

(iv) THE CHURCH

The Primacy of Peter, by Mgr. Charles Journet. Translated by John S. Chapin. Westminster, Maryland, 1954. 144 pp.

MGR. CHARLES JOURNET, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the "Grand Séminaire" in Fribourg, gives in this book the Catholic answer to Oscar Cullmann's work, *Peter, Apostle, Disciple, Martyr* (Neuchâtel 1952; English translation London, 1953).

Cullmann's doctrine, or rather his conclusions, are summarised in four pages. Then Mgr. Journet defines clearly the differences between the Catholic and Protestant idea of the Church and the Primacy. The discussion about the Primacy in its two aspects, personal primacy of Peter and primacy of his successors in the Roman See, is the central

part of the book. Then follows a chapter on the earliest literary documents on the stay of Peter in Rome and a short account of the Vatican excavations. The book ends with some clear and concise conclusions from the evidence presented.

It is a clear, straightforward book; a modern and readable treatise "De Ecclesia". It may be of interest in providing a brief idea of some modern theories (much spoken of just now) for those who have neither time nor inclination for more technical books. They will find in this work a summary of Cullmann's ideas and some valuable hints of the latest ideas of De Lubac, Congar and others. There is also a great deal of apologetic discussion: Protestant errors and inconsistencies, Catholic exegesis of the Gospel texts on the Primacy, Augustine's solution to the dispute of Peter and Paul at Antioch, and evidence from historical documents and the Vatican excavations as proof of Peter's stay at Rome, etc.

The author takes for granted that traditional Protestants admit the divinity of Christ, so there is no treatment of the question in the book. Some Catholic critics have pointed out that Mgr. Journet's book is not a full answer to the thorough exposition of Cullmann. Certainly there is not in it that amazing amount of learning and erudition which fills Cullmann's book, and on many occasions the answer to a historical difficulty is given from a dogmatic point of view, which obviously will not be accepted by non-Catholics.

However, the book is worth reading, while we wait for a fuller answer to the difficulties aroused by the great Protestant scholar.

Manuel Segura, S.J.

* * * *

1054-1954: *L'Eglise et les Eglises*. Vol. 1 and 2. Editions Chevetogne, Belgium, 1954.

ON the occasion of the ninth centenary of the Schism with the Oriental Church, the periodical "Irenikon" has published two large volumes, containing theological and historical studies of the problem of the Schism with a survey of the nine centuries of unhappy separation between East and West.

The first volume begins with a long and interesting study by Père Congar O.P. entitled "Nine Centuries After" in which he deals with the political, cultural and ecclesiological factors which prepared the ground for separation long before it was realised. Canon Cerfaux, Dom Dupont, O.S.B., Père Daniélou, S.J., Dom Strotmann, O.S.B., Père Pontet, S.J. have written on the unity of the Church and on the Schism from the standpoint of biblical and patristic theology. Père Daniélou's article treats of the notion of *Mia Ekklesia* in the early Greek Fathers. The third part of the volume is devoted to the history and the relations of the ancient oriental metropolitan Sees with each other and with Rome. Of particular value is Dom Marot's study of the Roman Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries and of the development of the Papal Primacy. The volume ends with a series of article on Byzantium and

the Orient up to the end of the Hiddle Ages, with special reference to Pope Leo III and the *Filioque*, to the importance of Psellos in the Schism, and to the Russian Church in 1054.

The second volume contains essays by a number of non-Catholic scholars whose opinions are thought-provoking even if they are not always orthodox. The first four articles of this second volume are concerned with monasticism and the spirituality of Byzantium with special stress on the cenobitic life which was more in favour than the eremitic, or hesychast, life. They are followed by some studies on Byzantine theology and liturgy. Noteworthy is Professor Alivizatos' study of the two regimes in the united Church before the Schism. He draws our attention to the possibility of a reunion of East and West on the basis of the same relations as those which prevailed before the separation. Professor Trembelas of Athens urging that the prayers of the Canon should once again be spoken aloud, argues that from the structure of the Anaphora and in the light of ancient testimony, it is clear that this prayer was recited aloud in the first centuries of the Church. The problem of the Reformation is dealt with by Mr. Peter Ives-Emery whose theme is "The Reformation of the 16th Century and the Oecumenical Councils" and by Professor Courvoisier who takes for his subject "The Schism in the Tradition and History of the Reformed Churches". The volume concludes with a consideration of various modern problems affecting reunion and the Oecumenical Movement with particular reference to the Orthodox and Anglican approaches to this question.

These two volumes are the fruit of a genuine effort on both sides to arrive at a better understanding of the differences between East and West and thus to prepare the ground for reunion. The line of approach is that of a psychological rapprochement, based on mutual love and sympathetic understanding. This alone can lead to the union that all the writes of this symposium still hope for so earnestly.

Paul Buhgiar, S.J.

(v) SCRIPTURE

Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testaments, by Edmund Sutcliffe, S.J. Nelson, 1955. 15/-.

HOW can the sufferings of the good man and the happiness of the sinners be reconciled with the justice of God? The struggles of the Hebrews to find an answer to this problem provide the subject of Fr. Sutcliffe's book. He does not confine himself, however, to a study of the Old Testament, but he provides as a background an account of the views of other ancient religions, treating in special detail the beliefs of the Babylonians, who were by race and environment so closely connected with the Hebrews. And finally, he completes the picture by showing how the gropings of the Old Testament reach their fulfilment in the New.

Within this setting he traces the course of Hebrew thought. He shows that the basic teaching was that evil was not according to God's plan, but was the fruit of man's own sin. That the whole race should suffer with Adam is a concept which the Hebrews regarded as natural and just, and one which pervades the Old Testament. Alongside this strong sense of corporate solidarity there existed, nevertheless, a recognition of individual guilt, and God's apparent inequity in not repaying man according to his deeds was a source of great perplexity as Fr. Sutcliffe illustrates in his account of the Psalms and the book of Job. It was only with the later knowledge of a future life that a full solution was possible, but already the notion of the vicarious suffering of the Servant of Jahweh in Isaias had prefigured the Passion of Christ in which the problem finds its final answer.

This book, by pursuing a single theme through the whole Bible, helps to show the connection and coherence of the whole. It gives a valuable exposition of the true meaning of many often-quoted passages of the Old Testament, and in its conclusion throws a new light on Christian penance and poverty, which has a practical and devotional application.

Bernard Hall, S.J.

* * * *

The Book of Psalms, by Mgr. Edward J. Kissane. Vol. 1. (Pss. i-lxxii) and Vol. 2. (Pss. lxxiii-cl). Brown & Nolan, 1953 and 1954. 30/- each.

MONSIGNOR KISSANE, president of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, has already established himself in biblical circles as a scholar of distinction by his studies of Isaiah and Job. He here provides a study of the psalms which is similar in presentation to his work on Isaiah.

A general introduction for the benefit of the beginner describes the general character, numbering and division of the psalms, their kinds and titles, metrical structure and authorship, and a short section is devoted to the texts and versions. Each psalm is introduced by brief notes on its subject matter and structure, to which a summary of the psalm's argument is appended. A translation of the psalm from the Hebrew is then set out in large type and followed by critical notes showing how the author has emended the Hebrew text. This in turn is followed by a commentary which includes a detailed discussion of any notable points in the psalm and sometimes the reason for emendations in the text.

Though Mgr. Kissane makes it clear in a modest preface that his work is intended for those students of theology who are unable to devote much time to any one book of the Old Testament, it is equally clear that such scholarly volumes will commend themselves also to the specialist. Indeed Professor Rowley and Fr. Tournay, O.P., Old Testament scholars of distinction, have already welcomed his first volume into the quickly growing literature on the psalms. Not of course that all are in agreement with every emendation. That is hardly to be ex-

pected of any work on the psalms at the present time. Thus some feel that Mgr. Kissane has here and there emended the Massoretic text where no emendation was strictly necessary, that a careful use of the Ugaritic texts would have restrained him. But all have clearly been stimulated by most of these suggested emendations, and Catholic writers concede that his work will take its place among the standard Catholic commentaries on the psalms.

The translations are deliberately literal, yet they are sufficiently readable to attract all those who love the psalms, not least all those who are committed to daily recitation of the office.

John Berrell, S.J.

* * * *

The Life of Christ, by Guiseppe Ricciotti. Translated by Alba Zizzamia. Bruce, Milwaukee, 1947. 703 pp.

MANY a life of Christ fails because it sets out to reflect and apply the day by day incidents of the life of Our Lord, violating in so doing the personal reflections and applications of the reader. It is with a certain pleasure therefore that we read in the preface of Ricciotti's work that "it has been my wish to write an exclusively historical and documentary work. I have studied the ancient fact and not the modern theory". The author has certainly been governed by this intent throughout the book. More than a quarter of it is taken up with a critical Introduction. Here is set down the geographical and historical background, the sources, the chronology, a brief excursus on the physical appearance of Our Lord and a study of the Rationalists' interpretations of His Life. This section is admirably done and is an excellent source of background information. The Life itself is simply presented as a historical narrative: the incidental material which he introduces illuminates the text and the setting. His more erudite asides, he relegates to footnotes, but this does not prevent frequent reference to the relevant portions of the Old Testament that the fuller understanding of the New requires.

In his Prologue, Ludolph the Carthusian sighed "But how much more delightful it is to behold this land with one's bodily eyes . . .": if photography had been an art in the days of Ludolph, his book, like this one, would have been filled with fine pictures.

Although the author sets out with the intention of giving facts alone, he admits that it is an impossible ideal, and that inevitably every writer will colour his work with his own state of mind. Throughout this work, Ricciotti shows his concern over the enemies of the Bible: he is ever returning and clearly exposing their heresies and disbeliefs.

There are, from time to time, translations which jar upon the reader, but not in such proportion as to spoil the effect and usefulness of the work as a whole.

Patrick Purnell, S.J.

(vi) OTHER QUESTIONS

La Spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus: Esquisse Historique, par J. de Guibert, S.I. Institutum Historicum S.I., Roma, 1953.

THE pioneering nature of this book and the authority of the writer make it a work of great importance.

The sub-title gives the scope of the book, which the author describes as comprising two parts, "a study of the personal experience of St. Ignatius, both in his own interior life and in his work of formation and direction, and secondly an outline of the spiritual development which took its rise from his experience and which has continued during the last four centuries". In a third part a summary is given of the leading ideas of Jesuit spirituality in the light of the history which has preceded.

The first part of the book is a most valuable short account of St. Ignatius, his methods of training members of the Society and his spiritual writings (in which the author includes the Constitutions of the Society), concluding with a summary of the influences on his spirituality and its main characteristics.

In the second part the matter is treated under headings of which the main ones are "the Saints", "administration of Society by Generals and General Congregations", and "spiritual writers". The history of the Sodality, the practice of frequent Communion, devotion to the Sacred Heart, and the Quietist controversy are accorded prominence.

Less space is devoted to the period from the 18th century to the present and this part of the book has not the same interest as the earlier part.

Impressions that remain after reading are of the continued recourse of Generals and General Congregations, even in times of great difficulty, to insistence on putting into practice what is contained in the Constitutions rather than a search for new methods, the reconciliation of the institution of the daily compulsory hour of mental prayer for all with the expressed opinions of St. Ignatius on the time to be given to prayer, the success of Fr. Roothaan's campaign for a more exact interpretation of the Exercises, which is not to be found, in the main, among earlier Jesuits, and throughout the centuries the key-position held by the Exercises in the lives of all Jesuits.

The spirit of enthusiasm for the foreign missions is shown to be one of the most obvious characteristics of Jesuit spirituality. However, the classroom was never far away and in 1681 a Fr. P. G. Iwanek published "*Novae Indiae, sive Perpetuum scholas inferiores docendi munus ad apostolicos Expeditionis Indicae labores proxime accedens*".

The book is also useful for reference and deserves a place in all our libraries.

Michael Flannery, S.J.

Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life. By C. S. Lewis. London, Geoffrey Bles, 1955. 15/-.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY is notoriously difficult. The author has to have something of real interest to say and the skill to say it. Mr. Lewis brings to the story of his conversion such shrewd observation and literary skill that the pace of his narrative never flags. Though there appears to be little "incident" to sustain the sense of motion, the book is to full of mental life and so free from pomposity that the reader can hardly find it dull.

One is reminded in this book of the Confessions of St. Augustine. Indeed the themes of both books are very similar. "Thou hast made us, O God for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee" is really the summing up of Mr. Lewis's search for "the sources of these arrows of joy" which had delighted and puzzled him from boyhood. Both authors are trained in the discipline of letters; both tried to find their satisfactions in the world of matter; both were first attracted and then repelled by a sort of Gnosticism. Mr. Lewis can say, "The key to my books is Donne's maxim. 'The heresies that men leave are hated most'. The things I assert most vigorously are those that I resisted long and accepted late". These truths he accepted when he realised that the joy he had so long tried to pin down and fix was only the track of Joy itself; the feeling of joy said, "It is not I. I am only a reminder. Look! Look! What do I remind you of?" One is reminded of the great cry of Augustine, "Late have I loved Thee . . ."

Some may find the text of the book too literary, but it must be remembered that the part played by books in the spiritual development of the author can hardly be exaggerated. None will find his wealth of quotation either affected or forced. For those who are interested in Mr. Lewis's writing as an example of technique in writing theology for popular consumption, this book will give valuable lights on his background, emotional, spiritual, intellectual, and social. Others will find the book most interesting as an example — almost as a case-history — in the matter of responsibility and religious psychology. Without wishing technical vocabulary on to the author, one might for example, look for the precise occurrence of the *assensus fidei*. Mr. Lewis is an excellent observer and reporter; but he succeeds in being objective without sacrificing interest.

Lachlan Hughes, S.J.